



PERISCOPE

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS

VOL. V, NO. 3, SUMMER 1980

Senate Approves Moderate Intelligence Bill

American Bar Association Also Counsels Moderation

Intelligence legislation continues its slow and winding progress through Congress thanks to the decision of the Senate Intelligence Committee to jettison 99% of the so-called Charter Bill and substitute a simple statement of Congress's oversight authorities for the elaborate "do's" and "don'ts" of S.S. 2284. At the same time AFIO can now look forward to the promise of very significant help in its lonely battle for sensible and restrained legislation. This comes in the form of support for our goals from a committee of the prestigious American Bar Association, which represents about 280,000 American lawyers and carries considerable weight on legislation affecting legal matters.

Taking first this latter development, the ABA Advisory Group on Intelligence Legislation has developed recommendations which now will be considered by the Standing Committee on Law and National Security, and if favorably acted upon by that Committee, will go to the governing body of the ABA for final acceptance. The ABA's Advisory Group's opinion closely parallels positions taken by AFIO on proposed intelligence legislation. This is the first time in recent memory that a private and highly respected American institution has associated itself with the principles long advocated by AFIO. Because we believe this is such an important development we quote the entirety of the Advisory Group's recommendation:

"The Standing Committee on Law and National Security recommends to the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association adoption of the following resolution:

"RESOLVED, that the American Bar Association adopts the following position with respect to Congressional oversight of the intelligence agencies and intelligence agency reporting to Congress:

1. The Hughes-Ryan Amendment of 1974 to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 should be repealed.

2. In its place, the National Security Act of 1974 (50 U.S.C. 401-403) should be amended to reduce the number of committees to which reports are made to the Intelligence Committee of the House and of the Senate.

3. In principle, any reporting and oversight legislation should not go beyond the existing practices of the

intelligence community and the reporting requirements imposed by Executive Order and by Senate and House resolution.

4. Due regard should be given to protection of classified information, to protection of intelligence sources and methods, and to applicable duties and authorities including those conferred by the Constitution in any legislated reporting requirements.

5. Any statutory reporting requirements should include appropriate exceptions to the requirement of prior notice or notice of significant anticipated intelligence actions to provide for limited reporting in exceptional circumstances.

6. S.2284, as reported by the Senate Intelligence Committee, May 15, 1980, could be an acceptable means of accomplishing the desired objectives."

Mr. John Warner, the AFIO Legal Advisor, has been representing AFIO's interest with the Advisory Group.

In the meantime the Senate voted acceptance on 3 June of S.2284, "The Intelligence Oversight Act of 1980". While bearing the same number as the 172-page "National Intelligence Act of 1980", this three-page bill merely amends the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the National Security Act of 1947. It reduces the reporting requirements of covert action undertakings from eight to two Congressional Committees, establishes conditions under which the President must give "prior" as opposed to "timely" ratification of covert

(see **SENATE**, page 2)

Inside This Issue . . .

**A SPECIAL AFIO
CONVENTION INSERT**

**Telling All You Need To Know
About Our 6th Annual Convention
3-4 October, 1980**

**See Pages 5 Thru 8 And Then
COME TO THE CONVENTION!**

The Voice Of A Turncoat

A *Periscope* Comment

A few days before we went to press, some of us at AFIO Headquarters had an interesting experience: we saw and heard John Stockwell testify before the Senate's Intelligence Committee. You know about Stockwell: the one-time CIA officer who became head of the Angola Task Force, and then upon departure from the agency publicly pronounced himself disillusioned, proceeded to write a book offering a vehemently critical version of operations and policies in Africa, and had it published without clearance. (The government's suit against him has just been settled out of court under provisions that cannot give him much comfort.) Criticism of our intelligence efforts and much of our foreign policy soon became something of a full-time preoccupation with him. Thus it was hardly surprising to find him, along with Philip Agee, as a star witness for the friendly folks who gave us the film *On Company Business*, discussed elsewhere in this issue.

The occasion for Stockwell's testimony was what is essentially a re-introduction — in a new legislative format — of the anti-disclosure bill, a measure designed to protect the identities of personnel who work under cover. How Stockwell came to testify on a day otherwise reserved for supporters of the legislation (Frank Carlucci for the CIA, John Blake for AFIO, and several members of Congress) is not entirely clear to us; a different date had been earmarked for most of the opposition. There was some indication that he asked for the opportunity to appear. He certainly got most of the press coverage. And, in a way that is a bit sad but nonetheless certain, he gave us reason to derive a measure of satisfaction from his appearance.

Stockwell left no doubt that he had come to argue. He had prepared a statement, but wanted to waste no time reading it. In his opinion, he had been misused by the CIA and badly treated by the Committee in the past. The Committee was allowing itself to be misled by CIA witnesses; thus it did not know the truth, whereas Stockwell did. CIA activities had been criminal and counter-productive; he could or would not talk about Soviet or Cuban intelligence activities in the same context. CIA's cover provisions had never been effective; therefore why did we need a law protecting identities? Such a law was, indeed, calculated only to hamstring writers, like Stockwell himself — even though, unlike Agee, he had chosen not to divulge the names of his one-time collaborators — and to stifle all kinds of criticism. In fact, he could not see a need for American clandestine operations at all, except perhaps in some exceptionally tight controlled societies; otherwise analysts could fill our intelligence bill. Etcetera.

As you can see, the allegations and contentions were too well-worn, and the interpretation too palpably biased, to be effective. But if Stockwell's words left the senators cold, his manner of delivering them could not have failed to raise the temperature. Stockwell, it seemed to us, went out of his way to be both rude and crude, continually interrupting the two senators present

in mid-sentence, and generally making it obvious that he knew how to speak but not how to listen. Partly as a result, perhaps, he suffered the most punishing verbal lashing we have ever witnessed at a congressional setting. Despite his protestations, he was repeatedly and vigorously charged with disloyalty to his country, distortion of facts and presumptuousness; his claim to knowledge superior to the Committee's, in particular, was torn to shreds, and his lack of concern about adversary intelligence efforts was dramatized. One senator eventually declared himself too disgusted to continue the questioning. When Stockwell later challenged him to a debate, the senator noted his own prohibitive disadvantage: he considered himself bound by his secrecy pledge; Stockwell obviously felt no similar inhibition. In the end, both senators agreed that a man who no longer believed in a clandestine service as a poor witness on methods of protecting clandestine service personnel.

Stockwell, it has been said, has allowed his frustrations to turn him into an enemy of his erstwhile friends. Perhaps so. There is always a temptation to seek psychological explanations and discern behavioral patterns, to wonder how someone evidently unsuitable for intelligence work can survive and even thrive in it for a time, and to ask how similar aberrations can be prevented in the future. We leave that type of question to those more directly concerned. Our observations are more mundane. We are pleased that the Stockwells of our time, instead of being harbingers of a new generation, are more frequently and more openly identified as outsiders who preach mainly to the converted and whose testimony damages them more than their targets. We are equally pleased that of the thousands who have served their country as intelligence officers, so few have turned out to be cast in the Stockwell mold.

(SENATE, continued from preceding page)

action undertakings, and establishes by law the right of the Congress to oversee intelligence activities of the Executive Branch. While the bill still contains some areas of concern, it is a far more acceptable alternative than the original version.

The Senate bill has been sent to the House of Representatives.

There has been one additional Senate action of considerable interest. Senator John Chafee, R-R.I., has introduced that portion of S.2216, the so-called Moynihan Bill, that would impose criminal sanctions for the unauthorized disclosure of the identities of covert intelligence personnel and also for publishing their names with the intent to impair or impede the intelligence activities of the United States Government. Messrs. Blake and Warner, in response to the invitation of the Senate Intelligence Committee, gave supporting testimony on 24 June 1980.



"MIRROR, MIRROR, ON THE WALL . . . WHAT FINALLY IS REFLECTED IS BEST FOR ALL!"

A Letter We Felt We Had To Share With You

Dear Mr. Blake:

I received PERISCOPE this week and, after reading it carefully, I am renewing my AFIO membership which expired in April.

I am an Associate member and have been happy to support AFIO's efforts to right the thinking of the general public and the Congress re the importance of a strong U.S. Intelligence Community. I thought (wrongly it seems) that the corner had been turned and that Intelligence was well on its way to being regarded as a most important and necessary part of our Government once again.

After reading your comments on the back page and some of the other articles, I reverse my opinion and enclose my \$20.00 membership fee in the hope that my small contribution will help in some way to get the message across.

Sincerely,
Roberta Bruce
376 Union Street
Braintree, Mass. 02184

AN ANALYSIS OF AFIO's MEMBERSHIP

Mrs. Charlotte Tully, one of our dedicated volunteers, has just completed a statistical analysis of the intelligence service of AFIO Full Members. The application forms of 2106 members were reviewed to acquire the necessary data. Excluded from the count were 265 Associate Members. Also excluded were all members who filled out previous editions to the current application form. These previous editions did not call for specific identification of intelligence service experience. The results of the statistical survey, therefore, encompass about 70% of our total membership. We estimate there may be a 5% degree of error in the tabulations because of the manner in which certain application forms were executed.

The exercise discloses the following numbers of people serving in the designated agencies:

CIA	773
ARMY	656
AIR FORCE	266
NAVY	172
D.I.A.	104
F.B.I.	57
N.S.A.	34
MARINES	30
STATE	14

'On Company (Monkey) Business' PBS Program Attacked By AFIO And Others

The Public Broadcast Service (PBS), a national network of affiliated locally-owned TV stations, recently made available to its affiliates a three-part alleged documentary entitled "On Company Business". Most affiliates showed this program in May.

PBS described this production as "a highly responsible overview of the CIA's history and as a major contribution to the ongoing debate on the CIA's past, present, and future". The co-producers of the program, Allan Francovich and Howard Dratch, have described their undertaking in much different and far more truthful terms. In a 1976 proposal to complete their project, they described their goal as follows: "The film will be the story of 30 years of CIA subversion, murder, bribery, and torture as told by an insider and documented with newsreel film of actual events". The producers said they would "show the broken lives, hatred, cruelty, cynicism and despair which result from U.S.-C.I.A. policy".

Philip Agee was the principal "insider" employed to narrate the CIA record. As Terrence O'Flaherty, TV writer of the San Francisco Chronicle has said, the final product is not a documentary but rather "it is an attempt to document on man's opinion of the CIA — in this instance, Philip Agee". Mr. O'Flaherty could have gone on and given credit to the support given Mr. Agee by co-narrators Victor Marchetti and John Stockwell. One of the more insidious aspects of this matter was the absolute failure of PBS and the producers to inform the reviewing public of the backgrounds of Agee, et al. All three were first presented on camera with merely their names and years of service in C.I.A. No mention was made of Agee's infamous conduct in exposing names of U.S. intelligence personnel abroad, or the fact that he has been deported from several foreign countries. No mention was made of court action by the U.S. Government against Marchetti or Stockwell.

AFIO has brought, and will continue to bring, pressure to bear against PBS, an organization partially supported by Federal funds, for the lack of balance contained in this program, and for their egregious error in not identifying the principal narrators. We have filed a formal protest with the President of PBS. On 20 June 1980, we sent a letter on this matter to all Senators and Congressmen on the Congressional Intelligence and Appropriations Committees. That letter said in part "Not only is Philip Agee given credit as a 'Special Consultant' but it is alleged he is a 20% partner in the profits of this production. How can we sit idly by while the taxpayer-funded Public Broadcasting Service sponsors the showing of such a film involving a CIA defector and a self-styled Communist revolutionary? Furthermore, PBS assists this defector in making money in his continuing efforts to destroy C.I.A."

AFIO is not alone in its position on this matter. A member has made available to us the following letter, signed by Mr. Ward B. Chamberlain, Jr., President, WETA 26, Washington, D.C. Mr. Blake has personally spoken with Mr. Chamberlain and verified the

authenticity of the letter. It is dated 10 June, 1980:

"Dear Mr. — — —

The CIA programs were very poor, and I apologize for broadcasting them. They had no business on PBS or WETA. I just let them slip by and should not have.

Sincerely,
Ward B. Chamberlain, Jr.
President"

AFIO would like to commend the forthright position taken by Mr. Chamberlain on this matter. It does, incidentally, raise the question as to how Presidents of other PBS affiliates feel on this matter. It is suggested members may wish to query local PBS affiliate executives and inform us of their stands. It may well be they failed to inform themselves properly on the nature of this program and, having seen it, would now take a position. We know what happened and where one station stands. There may be others.

FS Journal Requests Comments

The June 4, 1980, edition of *The Foreign Service Journal* contains an article entitled "Improving the Intelligence System." Mrs. Shirley R. Newhall, the editor of the *Journal* has suggested to AFIO that the article may be of interest to members, and has said she would welcome comments. The *Journal's* address is 2101 E. St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.



A gathering of members that took place in Cleveland on May 8. From left to right: John Howard, John Doullilis, Edward Lewis, Walter Morton, Fred Lewton and Miles Beran.

ON THE INTELLIGENCE BOOKSHELF...

Current books of interest to intelligence buffs and watchers of the world scene. All reviews are by AFIO members.

Ernest W. Lefever and Roy Godson, *The CIA and the American Ethic — An Unfinished Debate*. Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center (1980), 176 pp., cloth \$9.50, paper \$5.00.

Let us note at the outset that this is a remarkable book. This is not because its authors, in joining the "unfinished debate," support a strong American intelligence capability; others have done so, albeit in insufficient numbers and with the realization that the debate has for some years felt like a game played with a stacked deck. The book is remarkable because it introduces evidence which goes a fair distance toward explaining just *how* and *why* the deck has been stacked. The impact of the evidence is heightened by lucid and dispassionate presentation and by what must have been a conscious decision neither to mince words nor to waste them.

The book's brevity will impress itself upon the reader before he has a chance to form many substantive judgments. Not counting introductory remarks and annexes, the four chapters by Lefever and Godson and Charles M. Lichenstein's "Afterword" are compressed into 126 pages. Indeed, so much information has been packed into so small a space that one might wonder whether the content/space correlation does not defy Lefever's own method of quantitative analysis which, for instance, measures the impact of television in time units and percentages.

You might ask that question — provided you keep your tongue firmly in cheek. For Lefever's analysis is eminently sound and leaves no margin for overstatement. Fundamental to his outlook is the "just war doctrine" which, he holds, "has been an essential part of the Western moral tradition for a thousand years." According to the doctrine, wars — and, by extension, foreign policy measures and intelligence activities — are acceptable if they meet three criteria: the objective must be just, the means must be just and appropriate, and the chances for justice must be enhanced if the action succeeds. After briefly analyzing what kind of world we have to deal with, Lefever concludes, *inter alia*, that we need "an effective U.S. foreign intelligence establishment, including the capability for clandestine collection and covert action." But, he wonders, is our debate about intelligence "grounded in a clear sense of our national purposes and a realistic appreciation of the resources and instruments necessary to fulfill them"?

One approach to the question is a largely statistical examination of intelligence coverage in the evening news shows on ABC, CBS and NBC, presented by Lefever in Chapter 4. The test is supported by nine easy-to-read tables, based on a study of newscast abstracts assembled for a period of nearly five years and divided by topics covered and themes pursued in raising the topics. The results are conclusive, and they are devastating. In sum, the presentation of intelligence news is found to have been one-sidedly negative and devoid of perspective on foreign events against which American policy as well as intelligence activities should be measured; "perhaps . . . most striking" was "the near absence of reporting on the espionage and covert activities of adversary states," which made the CIA appear "to be operating in a political and moral vacuum devoid of threats and adversaries." We all have felt the climate; Lefever gives us the meteorological readings.

In his chapter on "Congress and Foreign Intelligence," Godson — whose prose, by the way is not quite as lean as Lefever's — undertakes, first, to trace the nature and history of pertinent legislation and oversight, and to show how Congress organized itself for its intelligence tasks and tried to improve the agencies' performance, reform some of their procedures and protect civil rights. Secondly, he looks at Congress as a medium of public information and education, and at the effect it has had in this role on intelligence capabilities. The degree of Congressional involvement, he correctly observes, is unique in world history; the performance he perceives as uneven. Godson is not impressed with congressional intelligence reform efforts; he finds too much concentration on past abuses and too little on improving performance. While he sees progress in establishing oversight, he senses a waning of congressional interest in a task that, by nature, is thankless in a publicity-prone environment. One of his observations parallels Lefever's: although the Senate Intelligence Committee is aware of threats to American security and civil rights by Soviet and other hostile services, "no hearings have been scheduled . . . No reports have been prepared. No legislation is being considered." ■

On the disproportionately small "pro-intelligence" side, Godson calls AFIO "the most active and, up to now, the most important organization." After providing a fair description of AFIO's activities,

he nevertheless deplores our "persistent disinclination to engage in any specific criticism at all of the way the agencies conduct the business of intelligence" which "has until now left the debate and the impetus for reform in the hands of those who favor radical change." Our members may be forgiven if they have their own thoughts about the virtues and wisdom of moving from an emphasis on common needs and values to the promotion of specific reforms.

Things of that sort aside, this is a book we unreservedly recommend. The Center's address is 1211 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

—Hans Moses

Arnaud de Borchgrave and Robert Moss, *THE SPIKE*, Crown, New York (1980). \$12.50.

You'll love it. Loyal ex-intelligence officers will relish this book — its theme, its contentions, and especially its villains. Parts of the novel are utterly refreshing, such as the investigation by Congress of *Soviet* intelligence operations. Yes, you'll absolutely love it!

The Spike is much like other cloak-and-dagger stories, replete with action and sex, moving from one world capital to another as the narrative unfolds. But the message is new — that the KGB has conducted, and continues to conduct, a massive disinformation program directed against the American public. (The spike in the title is a reference to the needle-like instrument on an editor's desk where stories not to be printed are impaled.)

The collaboration between authors Arnaud de Borchgrave and Robert Moss grew out of the ashes of terrorism in Munich in 1972. De Borchgrave, *NEWSWEEK*'s senior foreign editor, resident in Geneva, wrote an account of the murder of Israeli athletes which included the true names of some of the terrorists. After being threatened in numerous anonymous telephone calls, the journalist and his wife hid out in the English countryside, at the home of the Chairman of *The Economist*. He suggested to de Borchgrave that he might want to chat about his predicament with an *Economist* writer, a young Australian named Robert Moss, an expert on terrorism. Moss opined that telephone threats generally have intimidation as a purpose, and suggested that de Borchgrave go back to work.

Eight years later Moss and de Borchgrave wrote *The Spike*, a *roman a beaucoup de clefs*. Dozens of public figures, in Congress, in the media, even in the White House, will be easily recognized. The fictional cover over most of these characters is very thin indeed: the President of the United States, for instance, is described as Billy Connor, from Flats, Mississippi. Other characters dance through the story behind veils almost as gossamer. We recognize friends and foes, Seymour Hersh, Philip Agee — a thorough villain throughout — and many others. James Jesus Angleton is in the cast, of course. (There is a rumor in publishing circles that a new spy novel will *not* have Angleton as a character; I consider that purely speculative.)

The protagonist of *The Spike* is not an intelligence operative, but a journalist. We meet him first in 1967 in Berkeley, where he writes for a magazine called *Barricades*. We follow his political progress — he's in and out of bed along the way — through several countries and until he recognizes the value of the red, white and blue in the final pages of the book. By this time he is writing for *The Reader's Companion*, having joined the side of the angels, and having seen the light.

The light which Moss and de Borchgrave focus on Soviet covert operations illuminates some dark corners for those willing to entertain the notion that the KGB wants to influence American public opinion. During an NBC television interview, de Borchgrave quoted a real-life KGB misinformation chief as telling his agents, "We must constantly encourage Western journalists to write exactly the opposite of our real intentions. And anyone who writes about our real intentions objectively must be dismissed immediately as a 'cold war warrior.'"

The Spike is hawkish. It is pro-establishment, pro-intelligence. It is pro-American and anti-Soviet. Not the sort of book to appeal to the Eastern press (as of early July it had not been reviewed in *TIME*, *NEWSWEEK*, or *The New York Times*.) Certainly this novel has all the jingoist ingredients which, until recently, would guarantee its early demise in the literary market place.

But the book is selling in an extraordinary manner. After only a few weeks on the national best-seller lists, it is nudging its way to the very top of the golden ten. The sale for paperback rights was nine hundred and fifty thousand dollar! Moss and de Borchgrave are going to be exceedingly rich.

Perhaps it's another sign of changing times, and of changing public perceptions about intelligence operations, about the nature of the threat, and just who it is that wears the white hats, and who wears the black.

One thing I do know: you'll love *The Spike*. —George Spelvin

The following list of new members since the last issue is incomplete in that it does not include those who requested that their names be kept restricted.

LIFE MEMBERS

Mr. John T. Connor
Morristown, NJ
Mrs. Charlotta P. Engrav
Arlington, VA
Mr. Sidney N. Graybeal
Bethesda, MD
Mr. William H. Hamilton
Arlington, VA
COL G. Lynwood May, USAFR
Silver Spring, MD
COL Thomas A. McCrary, USA (Ret.)
Gainesville, GA
Mr. Hans Moses
Falls Church, VA

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

RADM Wreford G. Chapple, USN (Ret.)
Coronado, CA
Mrs. Norma Sue Davis
La Mesa, CA
Mr. Franklin E. Flannery
Jupiter, FL
Mrs. Lilley C. Herr
Chula Vista, CA
Mr. Bernyl H. Jackson
Potomac, MD
Mrs. Cleo J. Kray
Indialantic, FL
Mrs. Doris J. Reeder
Falls Church, VA
MAJ Hector F. Unger, USAF (Ret.)
San Francisco, CA
Mrs. Margaret E. Unger
San Francisco, CA

FULL MEMBERS

Mr. Thomas W. Ashley, Jr.
Indialantic, FL
Mr. Charles T. Bejuki
Philadelphia, PA
Mr. Walter J. Berger
Hollis, NY
Mrs. Winthrop Palmer Boswell
Hillsborough, CA
Mr. William S. Boyd
Hillsborough, CA
Mr. Marc S. Bradshaw
Waterford, CA
Miss Maurine O. Brinegar
Aiea, HI
Mr. Edward C. Connolly
Potomac, MD
CPT Joseph L. Crivelli, USAR
Bronx, NY
Mr. Richard Wayne Cromer
San Diego, CA
Mrs. Virginia Custer
Clearwater, FL
COL Joseph W. Darling, USAR (Ret.)
Pinetop, AZ
Mrs. Mary G. Dawson, II
San Carlos, CA
Mr. Harold P. Donahue
Clearwater, FL

Mr. Charles L. Duthie
Bluemont, VA
COL Dmitri Evdokimoff, USAF (Ret.)
Santa Rosa, CA
CDR Russell G. Fisher, USNR (Ret.)
Washington, DC
LTC Robert W. Fuller, III
McLean, VA
CDR Frederick W. Glaeser, USN (Ret.)
Gulf Breeze, FL
Mr. John R. Godbey
Little Rock, AR
Miss Cynthia M. Grabo
Arlington, VA
Dr. Edward G. Greger
Kensington, MD
Mr. Joseph T. Hart
McLean, VA
Mr. David W. Horne
Colorado Springs, CO
Mr. Jack Huntley
Santa Ana, CA
Mr. Thomas G. Isaly
Crosby, TX
Dr. Robert W. Kearns
Gaithersburg, MD
Mr. C. Terry S. Keep
Virginia Beach, VA
Mr. Robert E. Kessler
Alexandria, VA
Mr. Maurice F. Kiley
New York, NY
Mr. William C. Kinner
Greenville, ME
Mrs. Adelaide K. Kleber
Beaufort, SC
Mrs. Margaret L. Konski
Woodbridge, VA
Mr. Buford E. Lane
San Diego, CA
Mr. Nat Laurendi
Brooklyn, NY
CWO-4 Harry B. J. Lee, USMCR
Ventura, CA
COL Irwin A. Lex, USA (Ret.)
Pinellas Park, FL
CDR Wilton E. Lexow, USN (Ret.)
Locust Grove, VA
Mr. Edward W. Lyle
Washington, DC
Mr. Jack C. Massengale
Mt. Ranier, MD
Mr. Robert C. McCormack
Port Angeles, WA
COL Thomas A. McCrary, USA (Ret.)
Gainesville, GA
Mr. Patrick H. McGann
McLean, VA
Mr. Ernest R. Milde
Indian Lake, NY
Mr. W. Robert Nolan
Falls Church, VA
Mr. Robert M. O'Brien
Brooklyn, NY
Mr. James A. Olson
Sheridan, WY
Mr. John J. O'Toole
Glen Cove, NY

COL John B. Pratt USA (Ret.)
Arlington, VA
Mr. H. Carl Quitmeyer
Fairfax, VA
Mr. John C. Rasmus
Alexandria, VA
Mr. Rush H. Record
Houston, TX
MAJ Raymond R. Reusche, USAF (Ret.)
Alexandria, VA
Mr. Abner S. Riddle
Jupiter, FL
Mrs. Elizabeth Holm Riddle
Jupiter, FL
Mr. James M. Sandy
Wilmington, NC
LTC Maurice K. Schiffman, USA (Ret.)
San Francisco, CA
Mr. Donald T. Shea
Amarillo, TX
LTC Margaret E. Sinclair, USA (Ret.)
Aiea, HI
Mr. Frank R. Stockton
Boynton Beach, FL
Mr. William E. Stone
Meridian, MS
COL Frank M. Stubblefield, USA (Ret.)
Palmyra, VA
Mrs. Jane L. Taylor
Alexandria, VA
Mr. Harry S. Traynor
Lexington, KY
Mr. Manuel B. Viamonte
West Palm Beach, FL
COL William T. Walsh, USAFR (Ret.)
Leesburg, FL
Mr. Charles E. Wheeler
Easton, MD
Mr. Robert D. White
Potomac, MD
Mr. S. Lansing Williams
Rockville, MD
Professor Walton C. Zieg
Pittsburgh, PA

Editor's Note:

Our apologies to Robert C. Gardemal, Commander, USN (Ret.), for spelling his name incorrectly in our last issue.

OUR SPECIAL THANKS TO . . .

Both of these members made personal contributions to the AFIO treasury above and beyond the normal dues.

Charles E. Visconti
The Hon. John A. McCone

And We Also Thank. . .

The following companies who joined the ranks of our industrial associates:

The Eastman Kodak Company,
Rochester, N.Y.
Lockheed Electronics Company,
Plainfield, N.J.

Notes from National

AFIO MEMBERSHIP DIRECTORY. The cut-off date for the inclusion of names and addresses in the new Directory was information on hand as of 20 June 1980.

NEW DUES BILLING PROCEDURE

As a service to members, we are instituting a new method of giving notification concerning dues payments. Commencing with dues payable in September, members will be mailed an envelope addressed to AFIO in which to transmit their dues payment.

Confused About Your Dues Date? In some cases, so are we. In the first few years of AFIO's existence, dues were handled on a rather informal basis. Dunning notices were not sent and members' memories were pretty much relied on for the payment of dues. In 1977, membership cards were issued and these cards indicated a day and month dues were due, but not a year — meaning that dues were due on that day and month of every year. Unfortunately, however, the cards prepared in 1977 indicated, in most cases, the day and month a member paid his dues in 1977. This date often had little or no bearing on the member's actual date of membership, i.e., the day and month the member actually joined AFIO in 1975 or 1976. In some cases, this resulted in something of an injustice. For example, a member who joined AFIO in May of 1976, but who paid his dues in January of 1977, probably received a membership card showing a dues date of January whereas it should have been May. When AFIO acquired the capability in the last year or so of mechanizing its records and sending monthly dunning notices, the dues date discrepancies became a real problem. In quite a few cases, there was no solution except an arbitrary decision here in our office. What is a member's dues date who joined AFIO in May 1975 and has since paid dues in July 1976, April 1977, February 1978, etc.? We have tried to be fair in our decisions as to when your dues are due and hope you will advise us if you do not feel we have been fair to you personally. We must have a *firmly* set dues month for each member to utilize our mechanized billing.

AN AMENDMENT TO THE BY-LAWS

Interest continues to grow in AFIO Chapter activities. Following a recommendation made by the Advisory Council to appoint a Chapter Coordinator, we have been fortunate to obtain the volunteer services of John D. Jacobs. Mr. Jacobs had previous commitments that will keep him occupied until the middle of July. At that time he will assume his duties, and as a matter of priority, will first address himself to the long-standing matter of Chapter By-Laws.

An amendment to the AFIO By-Laws bearing on chapters will be introduced at the October National Convention. The recommended change comes about both because of the growth of the number of chapters as well as the growth in chapter activities.

Article III, Chapters, Section B, says in part:

"All classes of members are eligible to vote and hold office in local chapters."

It is the belief of both the Advisory Council and the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors that henceforth all Chapter Presidents and Vice-Presidents be full members of AFIO. Inasmuch as occupants of these two positions are normally the local AFIO spokespeople, the belief is that they should possess working intelligence experience. The amended language for Article III, Section B, to be presented for the vote of the delegates will read as follows:

"All classes of members are eligible to vote in local Chapters. Only Full Members of AFIO are eligible to hold office as Chapter President and Vice-President. Those serving as Presidents or Vice-Presidents at the time of the adoption of this By-Law and are not Full Members are eligible to complete their term of office."

Chapter Notes

CALIFORNIA

The first meeting of the new San Francisco Bay Area Chapter took place on 6 June 1980 at the Officers Club of the Presidio of San Francisco. Forty-one individuals were present, including Carl Eifler, Lee Echols and Don Perry, all of whom made the trip to help launch the new chapter. Also present was Lt. General Ray Peers, a Bay Area resident, who is a member of the AFIO Board of Directors.

Officers elected were:

President: Brig. General James O. Boswell, USA (Ret)

Vice-President, Membership: Lt. Colonel Emanuel Peters, USA (Ret).

Vice-President, Programs: Lt. Colonel Maurice Moyal, USAR.

Treasurer: Dr. David Pollock.

Bay Area residents desiring more information can contact General Boswell at 835 Black Mountain Road, Hillsborough, 94010.

Charles Cushman, President of the South Bay Chapter at Palos Verdes paid us a visit at the National Office on 23 June.

Do you like the new masthead on Periscope? The same round logo is now also being used on our stationery, brochure, and will be carried on the new Membership Directory. We are all deeply indebted to Leonard Parker of the San Diego Chapter for this development, which he graciously volunteered to do as a contribution to the cause.

NEW YORK

Jack Blake and his wife were the guests of the Greater New York Chapter at their meeting on 28 May. The enthusiasm and interest of the members was extremely noticeable. Derek Lee wins first place for the Host of the Year Award, followed closely by Bill Hood!

FLORIDA

Stan Phillips, as we know, is Regional Coordinator for the Southeastern States Region. He has a strange sense of geography. His sister was one of the attendees at the meeting of the new San Francisco Chapter! We trust by now she has rendered her report to Big Brother.

[see NOTES, page 12]

From The President's Desk: A Report From Jack Blake

Unlike my previous articles in *Periscope*, which have been devoted to a single theme, I would like to touch on several matters in this issue. One reason is to reach our constantly growing number of new members on matters of general AFIO policies as well as interest.

First, I would like to point out the apolitical nature of AFIO. We do not involve ourselves institutionally in partisan politics, nor do we endorse any candidate for public office. There are several reasons for this. The classical role of an intelligence officer is to avoid political alignments and view issues from an objective point of view. As an organization composed primarily of former intelligence officers, we should remain faithful to that posture. In the last several months we have rejected requests from candidates for public office who desired to be invited as speakers at our public functions. In one particular case we refused to provide a speaker to an organization endeavoring to prevent the re-election of an individual whose identity is a household name to members of the intelligence fraternity. While emotionally we may find some of the causes appealing, our success in pursuing our chartered mission can only be accomplished by avoiding the political arena and retaining a posture of objectivity concerning issues and aloofness from partisan activities.

In somewhat the same vein and for somewhat the same reasons, we do not take positions on matters pertaining to national military defense. Should SALT II be accepted or rejected; should the U.S. Navy have a smaller number of large, nuclear-powered carriers, or a larger number of oil-fired mini-carriers; should women serve in combat roles; these are policy, and at times political issues, and are not the historic preserve of intelligence officers. I dare say that even within our membership it might be difficult to obtain a consensus on certain significant military issues that the country is facing. Again, our charter empowers us to "promote public understanding of the role of American intelligence", and it is solely to that end that we should commit our talents, energy, and resources.

Turning now to an entirely different subject, I would like to share with you a few observations on the level of activity at the National office. It is growing! Every new member, and God Bless Them, adds to the administrative processing work load and gives us one more potential correspondent. We try to acknowledge every communication from a member — simple courtesy calls for it. This is an increased work load we welcome. Again we urge that you bring names of prospective new members to our attention. The recent spate of unfavorable TV showings concerning intelligence not only has disgusted us, but has called for additional work. An article elsewhere in this issue discusses our activity with Public Broadcasting System in connection with their nation-wide showing of "On Company Business". We were equally displeased with a recent CBS production. Because PBS does receive some Federal funds, and conducts public fund-raising solicitations, we have given them the number one target priority. In mounting our campaign we have been giving

and receiving assistance with a like-minded organization, on the basis that in unity there is strength.

I would urge each of you who have been contributors in the past to PBS to weigh future contributions carefully. I would likewise urge that all write directly to Mr. Larry Grossman, President, Public Broadcast System, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Washington, D.C. 20024, protesting the lack of balance in presenting this material, as well as the audacity of using Phillip Agee as a consultant and principle narrator. PBS took no steps to identify Agee as an individual who has turned his back on his country and exposed a considerable number of U.S. Government employees, and their families, to the potential of violence. While it may be argued that Agee has a right to be heard, he certainly has no right to this kind of exposure at the tax-payers' expense.

[NOTES, continued from preceeding page]

Note to General Boswell — be on the alert for a mole!

The Satellite Chapter met at Orlando, Florida on Saturday, 14 June. Gerry Davis, AFIO Florida President, attended the meeting.

Southeast Chapter members met at Palm Beach Gardens on 3 May. President Brophy had speakers to enlighten the attendees on the new Cuba refugee flow.

TEXAS

Action is commencing to organize the Lone Star Chapter. George Weinbrenner, 1236 Wiltshire Avenue, San Antonio, 78209, and Wendell "Tex" Little, 714 Moorside Drive, San Antonio, 78239, are the prime movers.

IN MEMORIAM

LTG Harold R. Aaron, USA (Ret.)
Annandale, VA

Mrs. Evelyn N. Briscoe
Falls Church, VA

COL Junichi Buto, USA (Ret.)
Laurel, Md.

Dr. Lester C. Houck
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Hugo Knoepfmacher
New York, NY

PERISCOPE is published quarterly by the Association of Former Intelligence Officers, McLean Office Building, 6723 Whittier Ave., Suite 303A, McLean, VA 22101. Phone (703) 790-0320.

Officers of AFIO are:

John F. Blake President
Capt. Richard W. Bates Vice President
Robert J. Novak Treasurer
Charlotta P. Engrav Secretary
Susan Barton Executive Assistant
Douglas S. Blaufarb Editor of PERISCOPE